

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawings: FIGS. 2, 6B, 7B

The Examiner objects to FIGS. 2, 6B and 7B because they should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated.

In response, the applicants have enclosed corrected versions of FIGS. 2, 6B and 7B each showing a legend "PRIOR ART". No new matter has been added. Consequently, the applicants respectfully requested the Examiner to withdraw the objections to FIGS. 2, 6B and 7B.

Allowable Subject Matter Claims 2-5

The Examiner objects to claims 2-5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, the applicants have rewritten claim 2 into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice. The applicants have not abandoned the subject matter of claim 1 and reserve the right to file a continuation application directed thereto.

In addition, the applicants have amended claims 6, 7 and 9 to change their dependency from cancelled claim 1 to now independent claim 2. No new matter has been added.

Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to claims 2-5 and in the claims 3-11 now depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 2, the applicants further respectfully request that the Examiner consider claims 2-11 allowable subject matter.

Objections: Claims 1-11

The Examiner objects to claims 1-11 because the words are crowded too closely together, making reading and entry of amendments difficult. Substitute claims with spaces between the words are suggested.

In response, the applicants have cancelled claim 1 without prejudice. The applicants have provided a new set of claims 2-11 spaced in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Consequently, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to claims 2-11.

Specification Objections

The Examiner objects to the specification because the words are crowded too closely together making reading and entry of amendments difficult. The Examiner suggests putting spaces between the words.

In response, the applicants are enclosing a substitute specification with spacing according to the Examiner's suggestion. The right justification has been removed to permit proper spacing. Since there are no changes to any of the text wording of the specification, a version showing underlining or strikeout is not necessary.

In view of the substitute specification, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification.

35 U.S.C. 103(b) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeng et al (US 5,741,624 – filed February 13, 1996 – issued April 21, 1998) and the Admitted Prior Art (APA) of the specification pages 3-5.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeng and the APA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Batra et al. (US 6,200,906 – filed December 17, 1998 – issued March 13, 2001).

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeng and the APA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bartha et al. (US 5,635,337 – filed May 5, 1993 – issued June 3, 1997).

The applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that claim 2 has been rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim 1. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

In addition, the applicants have amended claims 6, 7, and 9 to change their dependency from cancelled claim 1 to now independent claim 2. Consequently, claims 6-11 now depend directly or indirectly upon allowable claim 2. As a result, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The foregoing amendment and remarks, in conjunction with the enclosed corrected versions of FIGS. 2, 6B and 7B, establish the patentable nature of the rejected claims remaining in the application, i.e., claims 6-11. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony N. Fresco
Registration No. 45,784

SCULLY, SCOTT, MUPRHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343/4366 Fax

ANF:yd